| | 5 YEA | R STRATEGIC PLA | AN FOR INDIAN | NA'S BASIC CIP GRAN | T (2007-2012) | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Issue Addressed | Activity | Responsibility | Date | Interim Benchmark | Outcome | Indicator |
| Collaboration Between The Courts And The DCS With Regard To The CFSR | Participation in the Statewide Assessment (completed) | CIP Grants Administrator recruit trial court judge | Late 2006 through July, 2007 | CIP Grants Administrator and several judges participated on Steering Committee and subcommittees and assisted in drafting section on case planning and reviews Attending all planning and final meeting Grant Administrator participating in all CSFR conference calls Agency Director and Chief Justice meeting frequently throughout the process | That the CFSR, particularly the PIP will be a process by which the SYSTEM assesses and addressed needed reform in Indiana The Statewide Assessment will include the perspective of the Judges who are in a good position to provide insight into the data and the practical implications of the data indicating need for improvement. | collaborate to conduct an accurate and thorough evaluation of the statewide system Courts and DCS will come to understand their respective roles and responsibilities in the child welfare system Courts and DCS will collaborate in a meaningful way |
| | Meet with judges whose counties are involved in the onsite reviews (completed) | CIP Grants Administrator and Deputy from agency | May and June, 2007 | Meetings with individual judges in Marion, Montgomery and Jefferson Counties | | Judges whose counties are Review sites are better prepared and understand the process better: Reviews run smoothly |
| | Participation in the onsite review (completed) | CIP Grants Administrator to recruit 4 trial court judges to serve as reviewers in the CFSR. CIP Grants Administrator to serve as a reviewer State Director of GAL/CASA (Indiana Division of State Court Administration) to serve reviewer. | July 9-13, 2007 | 4 judges, GAL/CASA Director and CIP Grants Administrator serve as reviewers | | 4 judges will have a better understanding of the agency, will be helpful in engaging their colleagues in the PIP process. Judges, as knowledgeable stakeholders bring a significant perspective to the process. GAL/CASA perspective will also be present. CIP Grants Administrator will be prepared to assist in implementation of PIP |

| | 5 YEA | R STRATEGIC PL | AN FOR INDIAN | NA'S BASIC CIP GRAN | T (2007-2012) | |
|--------------------|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| Issue Addressed | Activity | Responsibility | Date | Interim Benchmark | Outcome | Indicator |
| | Inform all trial court judges of the results of the CSFR, particularly the PIP when it is completed [1] (completed) | CIP Grants Administrator DCS Director Payne | , | CIP Grants administrator makes presentation at 2007 and 2008 annual juvenile court judges meetings and continues to meet with JJIC on a monthly basis | | Judges are aware of the PIP and have the opportunity to play an active role in developing strategies for implementing changes that have a better chance of successful outcomes |
| | New Update all Juvenile Court Judges on the status of the CFSR and Program Improvement Plan (PIP), with special emphasis on the legal/court related action steps in the PIP. | CIP Grants Administrator | June, 2010 | | Juvenile Court Judges are knowledgeable about the CFSR and PIP requirements | CFSR/PIP update presented at the Annual Juvenile Judges conference in June, 2010 |
| | Implementation of PIP | CIP Grants Administrator to facilitate ongoing collaboration with the DCS as needs are identified and the PIP is formulated | (see above) Revised July 2009 through July, 2011 | Once the PIP has been accepted by ACF, DCS, TASK Force and CIP Grants administrator will continue to discuss the courts' role in implementation. | Successful statewide implementation | Judges are informed of the PIP requirements and are involved in the implementation of the PIP in those areas that include or impact the court process |
| | Identify any changes in legislature that might be suggested as a result of the CFSR | CIP Grants Administrator, DCS staff, Task Force, Juv. Justice Improvement Committee[1] | (see above) Revised ongoing throughout the implementation of the PIP | If needed, DCS and Courts collaborate on necessary statutory changes | | Barriers to best practices that may be attributed to statutory requirements are removed |

| | 5 YEA | R STRATEGIC PL | AN FOR INDIAN | IA'S BASIC CIP GRAN | T (2007-2012) | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Issue Addressed | Activity | Responsibility | Date | Interim Benchmark | Outcome | Indicator |
| | Identify any changes in court rules or court practices that might be suggested as a result of the CFSR | CIP Grants Administrator, DCS staff, Task Force, Juv. Justice Improvement Committee | (see above) Revised ongoing throughout the implementation of the PIP | If needed, Indiana Supreme Court will address changes | | Changes or amendments through rules or judicial education regarding best practices are implemented |
| | Educate judiciary on changes in DCS policy or practice as a result of CFSR | | (see above) Revised ongoing throughout the implementation of the PIP | | | Better understanding between courts and the DCS |
| | New Plan for initiatives in response to needs identified in CFSR and PIP | CIP Grants Administrator, Task Force, Indiana Judicial Center Staff | July 2009 through the implementation of PIP | Regular meetings with Task Force, Indiana Judicial Center Staff and DCS to collaboratively determine how CIP funds can be allocated to best improve outcomes of safety, permanency and well being for children in foster care in Indiana | | |
| | ne meets regularly with the Juv | | | | | |
| Continued Collaboration On The IV-E Review | Participation by the courts in the next IV-E Review (completed) | Administrator to collaborate with the DCS to get courts involved | Last review was Oct. 2005. Indiana was in substantial compliance. Next review within 3 years. Update The IV-E review occurred January 26-29, 2009 | Court participation in IV-E review | A more thorough and informed review that includes the participation and perspective of the bench. | Courts actively and in a meaningful way participate in the reviews and the PIP, if any. |
| Collaboration Regarding HEA 1001 | | | | | | |

| Issue Addressed | Activity | Responsibility | Date | Interim Benchmark | Outcome | Indicator |
|--------------------|---|--|---|----------------------|---------|-----------|
| | and representative juvenile judges in legislative meetings | DCS Director and Deputies, Representative judges | June-July 2007 | | | |
| | between members of the Juvenile Justice Improvement | Members of the committee DCS Director and Deputy | Aug 2007-March 2008 | | | |
| | · | Indiana Judicial Center Staff Benchbook Committee DCS Staff | July-Dec. 2008 and ongoing reevaluation thereafter | | | |
| | evaluation and revising of policies, procedures and forms used in the | Indiana Judicial Center Staff DCS Staff Juvenile Justice Improvement Committee | Jan-June2009 Revised ongoing | | | |

| Issue | Activity | Responsibility | Date | NA'S BASIC CIP GRAN | Outcome | Indicator |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Addressed | Activity | Responsibility | Date | Benchmark | Outcome | indicator |
| to finalize adoptions | Determine statewide how many adoptions pending 6, 12, and 18 plus months after entry of judgment on TPR. | CIP Data Analyst CIP Grants Administrator | June 2008-Jan. 2009 Revised 2010 | Confirm our anecdotal assumption that children are awaiting adoption for too long | Timely Permanency for children free for adoption | Reliable data provides accurate information regarding the length of time from TPR to adoption for children for whom adoption is the permanency plan |
| | Share statewide data regarding the number of adoptions pending 6, 12, and 18 plus months after entry of judgement on TPR | CIP Grants Administrator DCS Staff Revised CIP Data Analyst, CIP Grants Administrator, DCS staff | Jan./Feb2008 Revised 2010 | Each county has data regarding length of time from judgment of TPR to adoption. | Reduction in time from TPR to adoption | Courts will recognize delays in permanency for children awaiting adoption based on reliable data |
| Explore efforts to expedite appeals in other | Research efforts to expedite appeals in other jurisdictions | Executive Director, Division of State Court Administration Revised CIP Data Analyst | July-Oct 2008 Revised January 2009 through September 2009 | Research completed | | Research provides information as to how othe jurisdictions handle TPR appeals |
| iurisdictions Explore need to expedite TPR appeals in Indiana | Collect Data re: Number of appeals from TPR judgments from each county; Length of time from filing of Notice of Appeal through decision handed down: Length of time from end of briefing until decision is handed down (completed) | CIP Grants Administrator Data Analyst Revised CIP Data Analyst | June 2008-Jan. 2009 | Research completed | | We have reliable data regarding the cause of delays, if any, in the appellate process in finalization of adoption |
| | Discussions with the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals re: the data collected the need, if any, to expedite appeals of TPR's (completed) | Executive Director, Div. Of State Court Administration CIP Data Analyst | OctDec 2008 | Meeting takes place | | Exploration of how to reduce delays in for children for whom the appellate process may be a delay in permanency |

| Issue Addressed | Activity | Responsibility | Date | Interim Benchmark | Outcome | Indicator |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | Ongoing discussions of needed changes, if any, to the appellate procedure depending on the review of the data | Indiana Supreme Court | Jan. 2009 and ongoing | | Timely Permanency for children free for adoption | |
| in Child Welfare Proceedings | Seek 3 counties as Pilot Project volunteers to conduct monthly file reviews on cases that are older than 12 months (completed) | | Feb/Mar2008 Revised February/ March 2008 through November 2009 | 3 counties in which the length of time from judgment of TPR to adoption is over 6 months agree to participate in pilot Revised 3 counties agree to participate in the pilot | | Recognition of need to reduce delays in permanency in the pilot counties |
| | Develop a protocol/form for Review Team to identify cases and establish a regular and routine review of cases (completed) | CIP Grants Administrator Judges in pilot counties | Apr-08 | Forms for file review are developed | | Process for file review is developed |
| | Establish a protocol for how to identify and address or respond to the reasons for delay | CIP Grants Administrator Judges and DCS directors in pilot counties | May/June, 2008 Revised Ongoing throughout pilot project | Protocol is developed and adopted in pilot projects | | Process for file review and action plan is in place |
| f f | <u>'</u> | CIP Grants Administrator DCS Staff Judges DCS local directors in pilot counties | July-Oct. 2008 Revised July 2008 through November 2009 | Teams are established and trained on forms and protocol | | Teams are in place and ready to begin reviews |
| | Implement the project | Judges and DCS directors in pilot counties | August, 2008 through May, 2010 | Teams are meeting on a scheduled basis and reviewing files | | File Reviews are identifying barriers and reducing time |

| | 5 YEA | R STRATEGIC PLA | AN FOR INDIA | NA'S BASIC CIP GRAN | IT (2007-2012) | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| Issue Addressed | Activity | Responsibility | Date | Interim Benchmark | Outcome | Indicator |
| | Evaluate the success of the pilot projects | CIP Grants Administrator, Judges and DCS directors in pilot counties | Update June 2010- August 2010 | Evaluations completed | | Delays in child welfare proceedings are reduced in pilot counties |
| | If the pilot projects are successful in reducing delay, identify 3 more counties to agree to pilot the project Revised If the pilot project is successful in reducing delay, develop and implement a statewide roll-out plan | CIP Grants Administrator Revised CIP Grants Administrator, DCS | 10/1/2009 Revised June 2010- August 2010 | Additional counties are added | | delays in child welfare proceedings are reduced statewide |
| Forum for ongoing meaningful collaboration between DCS, Courts and other Stakeholders | Create a multi-Disciplinary Task Force (completed) | Chief Justice CIP Grants Administrator Director of DCS | Feb/Mar2007 | | Collaboration between the courts and child welfare stakeholders | Opportunity for meaningful and ongoing collaboration between stakeholders Input from all stakeholders regarding CIP projects |
| | Select members of task force and name a chair (completed) | Chief Justice Director of DCS | Feb/Mar2007 | Members are selected in collaboration between courts and the agency | | Representative membership |
| | Invite members to participate (completed) | CIP Grants Administrator | Mar-07 | Task Force is formed | | Prospective members accept the invitation to serve on the Task Force |
| | Convene the Task Force (completed) | CIP Grants Administrator Task Force Chair | Apr-07 | Meets for the an orientation | | First meeting is held |

| Issue | | | | NA'S BASIC CIP GRAN | , | |
|-----------|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| Addressed | Activity | Responsibility | Date | Benchmark | Outcome | Indicator |
| | Define Missions and Goals for the Task Force (completed) | Task Force | Apr-07 | The Task force defines itself | | Mission and Objectives are established |
| | Establish regular meeting dates and times (completed) | Task Force Chair | April/May2007 | Commitment to ongoing participation | | Task Force continues to meet |
| | Plan and set goals (completed) | Task Force Members | May/June 2007 | Task Force collaborates and provide input for CIP Grant strategic plans | Task Force will have established a plan for the direction it intends to take | CIP Strategic Plans are established. |
| | Review the CFSR report and suggestions for PIP (completed) | Task Force Members | June-July 2008 | All members of the task force review the CFSR Report and come to a meeting prepared to suggestions for the PIP | | Task Force has contributions to make to the PIP development through the CIP Grants Administrator |
| | Review PIP | Task Force Members | When the PIP has been prepared Revised June 2009 through completion of PIP | Task force reviews the PIP and make suggestions on how CIP can help implementation the PIP | | Task Force has contributions to make to the PIP implementation through the CIP Grants Administrator |
| | Monitor implementation of PIP | CIP Grants Administrator and Task Force Members | When the PIP has been approved and ongoing Revised June 2009 through completion of PIP | | | PIP is implemented Improvement in outcomes |
| | Continue to meet on a monthly basis through the PIP process and determine how often to meet thereafter Revised continue to meet regularly and assist in CIP planning | Task Force members | 2008-2012 | Task Force continues to evaluate needs and discusses programs and or initiatives to address those needs | | Task Force makes contributions to the adjustment and finalization of future strategic plans |

| | 5 YEA | R STRATEGIC PLA | AN FOR INDIA | NA'S BASIC CIP GRAN | T (2007-2012) | |
|--------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Issue Addressed | Activity | Responsibility | Date | Interim Benchmark | Outcome | Indicator |
| Needs of Local Courts | Continue to provide CIP funding for existing subgrants and to encourage other counties to replicate [2] existing successful projects Revised Provide CIP subgrants to programs and projects that support the safety, well-being and permanency of children and families involved in the child welfare system | CIP Executive Committee and Trial Court Judges Revised CIP Executive Committee | Ongoing 2007- 2012 | CIP Exec. Committee receives sub-grant proposals to replicate programs that have been successful Revised CIP Executive Committee receives sub-grant proposals that offers programs or services that provide for the safety, well-being and permanency needs of children and families involved in the child welfare system | Better outcomes for children and families in the areas of safety, well-being and permanency | Implementation of programs that have demonstrated success statewide Revised Implementation of programs or services that provide for the safety, well-being and permanency needs of children and families involved in the child welfare system |
| | Address emerging local needs identified as a result of the CFSR, our Data Collection, the Indiana Summit for Children and the Task Force. | CIP Executive Committee Trial court judges CIP Grants Administrator Revised CIP Executive Committee, CIP Grants Administrator, Task Force, Indiana Judicial Center Staff | Ongoing 2007- 2012 | CIP exec. Committee receives sub-grant proposals for identified needs | | New initiatives that are responsive to needs identified in the CFSR and the PIP are implemented Revised New initiatives, programs or services that address the identified needs are implemented. |
| | Evaluate the success of the sub-grant initiatives | CIP Executive Committee Trial court judges CIP Grants Administrator Revised CIP Executive Committee, CIP Grants Administrator | Ongoing 2007- 2012 | Sub-grantees submit evaluations in their final reports | | Sub-grantees have good information about the positive impact of their grants. |

^[2] Indiana CIP has awarded sub grant to support such initiatives as facilitation/mediation in CHINS and TPR, Drug Courts in CHINS, Mental Health Courts, Family Court pilots, as well as Technical Support and assistance with case management through the Supreme Court's JTAC

| | 5 TEA | K SIKAIEGIC PL/ | AN FUK INDIAI | NA'S BASIC CIP GRAN | 1 (2007-2012) | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---------------|--|
| Issue Addressed | Activity | Responsibility | Date | Interim Benchmark | Outcome | Indicator |
| Addressed Assessment of the courts' role in the effectiveness of the interstate placement of | Conduct Survey of local practices (completed) | CIP Grants Administrator | Feb./March 2008 | Survey is developed, distributed and returned | | CIP Grants Administrator and Indiana Supreme Court will have information about local practice with regard to the interstate placement of children. |
| children | Conduct File Reviews, depending upon survey responses Update based upon the survey results, it was determined that file reviews were not necessary. | CIP Grants Administrator | April/May 08 | Files in select counties are reviewed, judges interviewed regarding local practice involving the interstate placement of children | | See above |
| | Draft a report of the assessment of the trial courts' role, responsibilities and effectiveness in the interstate placement of children. (Completed) | CIP Grants Administrator | Jun-08 | Report completed | | Need for any changes in practice are identified |
| | Form an ad hoc committee of the Task Force to evaluation what improvements are needed and how to implement necessary changes in practice, if any. | CIP Grants Administrator, Ad Hoc Committee | August, 2008 through August 2009 | Committee is formed, reviews the report and makes suggestions for change to be included in strategic plan | | Needed changes identified and planning for those changes takes place |
| | Update An ad hoc committee was not formed as the ICPC assessment report did not identify any changes in practice that needed to occur. | | | | | |